Total survey respondents: 2265 Response rate: 94 %

Information about your program and working with your Support Provider

1. How long after you were	hired into an assignment that requires a					
California preliminary teach	ing credential were you enrolled in a	2	261	99.8%		
Commission-approved induc	DNR	4	0.2%			
1 =	At the time of hire or before beginning work with students					Mean
			762	33.7%	1.78	SD
2 =	Within one to two months of beginning my assignment		401	17.7%		
3 =	Within three to five months of beginning my assignment		96	4.2%		
4 =	More than five months after beginning my assignment		111	4.9%		
5 =	One year or more after beginning my assignment		891	39.4%		
2. How long after you were	enrolled in your induction/clear credential					
	king with a Support Provider (SP) or receive	2	249	99.3%		
support from Clear Credenti	al Personnel?	DNR	16	0.7%		
1 =	Within one month of enrolling in the program	1	914	85.1%	1.26	Mean
2 =	Within two months of enrolling in the program		192	8.5%	0.76	SD
3 =	More than three months after enrolling in the program		80	3.6%		
4 =	I was assigned a Support Provider but never worked with him/her		11	0.5%		
5 =	I was never assigned a Support Provider		52	2.3%		
		2	250	22.224		
3. What was the length of y	our clear induction program?		250	99.3%		
		DNR	15	0.7%	9.53	
-	Less than 1 school year		123	5.5%		Mean
2 =	1 school year		680	30.2%	1.08	SD
3 =	More than 1 school year but less than 2 school years		153	6.8%		
4 =	2 school years	1	215	54.0%		
5 =	More than 2 school years		79	3.5%		

How helpful was your Support Provider/Mentor/System of Support in helping you impact students in learning regarding the following:

4a. Modeling instruction while I observed		2	2245	99.1%		
		DNR	20	0.9%		
1 =	Very Helpful	1	1353	60.3%	1.59	Mean
2 =	Helpful		557	24.8%	0.85	SD
3 =	Somewhat helpful		237	10.6%		
4 =	Not at all helpful		98	4.4%		
41 71 116 1		2	2241	98.9%		
4b. Identifying Resources		DNR	24	1.1%		
1 =	Very Helpful	1	L492	66.6%	1.43	Mean
2 =	Helpful		561	25.0%	0.68	SD
3 =	Somewhat helpful		158	7.1%		
4 =	Not at all helpful		30	1.3%		

Total survey respondents: 2265 Response rate: 94 %

4c. Providing feedback from	n observations to improve my instruction	2239	98.9%		
, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		DNR 26	1.1%		
1 =		1537	68.6%		Mean
2 =		515	23.0%	0.69	SD
3 =		147	6.6%		
4 =	Not at all helpful	40	1.8%		
4d. Teaching Practices		2233	98.6%		
4d. reaching Fractices		DNR 32	1.4%		
1 =	Very Helpful	1428	63.9%	1.47	Mean
2 =	Helpful	596	26.7%	0.71	SD
3 =	Somewhat helpful	174	7.8%		
4 =	Not at all helpful	35	1.6%		
		2234	98.6%		
4e. Content Support		DNR 31	1.4%		
1 =	Very Helpful	1311	58.7%	1.55	Mean
2 =	Helpful	660	29.5%	0.76	
3 =	Somewhat helpful	210	9.4%		
4 =	Not at all helpful	53	2.4%		
		2231	98.5%		
4f. Instructional Design and	d Planning	DNR 34	1.5%		
1 =	Very Helpful	1276	57.2%	1.57	Mean
2 =		685	30.7%	0.75	
3 =		227	10.2%	0.75	30
3 = 4 =		43	1.9%		
7 -					
		2231	98.5%		
4g. Creating and Maintainir	ng a Safe and Positive Climate	DNR 34	1.5%		
	Very Helpful	1449	64.9%	1 45	Mean
1 =	The first of	594	26.6%	0.69	
2 =	Somewhat helpful	154	6.9%	0.09	SD
	Not at all helpful	34			
4 =	Not at all Helpful	34	1.5%		
		2225	00 507		
4h. Using strategies to supp	port English Learners	2232	98.5%		
		DNR 33	1.5%	1.00	
1 =		1223	54.8%		Mean
2 =		665	29.8%	0.81	SD
3 =	·	277	12.4%		
4 =	Not at all helpful	67	3.0%		
4i Using strategies to supp	ort students with disabilities	2234	98.6%		
Johns strategies to supp		DNR 31	1.4%		
1 =	Very Helpful	1588	71.1%		Mean
2 =	Helpful	470	21.0%	0.67	SD
3 =		142	6.4%	-	
4 =	Not at all helpful	34	1.5%		

Total survey respondents: 2265 Response rate: 94 %

4j. Minimizing bias and using culturally responsive pedagogy		2	233	98.6%		
		DNR	32	1.4%		
1 =	Very Helpful	1	348	60.4%	1.52	Mean
2 =	Helpful		653	29.2%	0.74	SD
3 =	Somewhat helpful		183	8.2%		
4 =	Not at all helpful		49	2.2%		
Alc Cotting and reaching Dra	Afactional Learning Coals	2	233	98.6%		
4k. Setting and reaching Pro		DNR	32	1.4%		
1 =	Very Helpful	1	539	68.9%	1.39	Mean
2 =	Helpful		539	24.1%	0.66	SD
3 =	Somewhat helpful		125	5.6%		
4 =	Not at all helpful		30	1.3%		
E. How well matched were v	vou with your Cupport Providor?	2	081	91.9%		
5. How well matched were y	ou with your Support Provider?	DNR .	184	8.1%		
1 =	Well matched	1	838	88.3%	1.14	Mean
2 =	Somewhat well matched		200	9.6%	0.40	SD
3 =	Not well matched		43	2.1%		

If you responded that you were "Not well matched" or "Somewhat well matched" with your Support Provider please respond to Questions 6a and 6b:

6a. in which of the following areas could the match have been improved?		239	98.4%		
Mark all that apply		DNR 4	1.6%		
	Grade level or subject area experience or background	125	52.3%		
	Familiarity with site resources, expectations, policies, and procedures				
	and procedures	79	33.1%		
	Schedules /opportunities to meet	72	30.1%		
	Personality, disposition, and working style	64	26.8%		
	Teaching philosophy and style	53	22.2%		
Ch. Did the museum adduse	a the inque(a) with the matter?	239	98.4%		
6b. Did the program address	s the issue(s) with the match?	DNR 4	1.6%		
1 =	Yes	59	24.7%	2.03	Mean
2 =	To some extent, but not fully	114	47.7%	0.72	SD
3 =	No	66	27.6%		

The following question asks about the interaction between you and your Support Provider. This includes all face-to-face or virtual interactions via technology.

7. On average, how frequently did you and your Support Provider have		2084	92.0%		
		DNR 181	8.0%		
1 =	Daily	220	10.6%	2.77	Mean
2 =	Two or three times per week	503	24.1%	0.97	SD
3 =	Weekly	994	47.7%		
4 =	Twice per month	263	12.6%		
5 =	Less than twice per month	104	5.0%		

Statewide Results

Total survey respondents: 2265 Response rate: 94 %

8. Across the full induction/clear program, how frequently did your Support Provider observe and coach you in your classroom during the program (in person or via visual technology)?		91.7%		
577				
1 = More than ten times during the entire program	520	25.0%	2.33	Mean
2 = 6-10 times during the entire program	627	30.2%	1.02	SD
3 = 3-5 times during the entire program	708	34.1%		
4 = Once or twice during the entire program	164	7.9%		
5 = I was not observed by my Support Provider	57	2.7%		
9. What amount of interaction with your Support Provider would have been best for you?	2075 DNR 190	91.6% <i>8.4%</i>		
1 = Significantly more time	99	4.8%	2.85	Mean
2 = A little more time	247	11.9%	0.61	I
3 = The same amount of time I had	1624	78.3%		30
4 = A little less time	81	3.9%		
5 = Much less time	24	1.2%		

Connections between your induction/clear program and your Individual Induction Plan (IIP).

The next set of questions asks you to reflect on your engagement with formative assessment activities during your induction and credential program experience.

	istrict or on site and induction/clear credential	2020	89.2%		
program goals and activiti	es?	DNR 245	10.8%		
1	= Strong	1080	54.8%		Mear
2	= Moderate	759	38.5%	0.62	SD
3	= Weak	132	6.7%		
	Not applicable to me *	49	-		
11 How strong was the s	Maharatian batwaan your industion or class	2019	89.1%		
credential program and yo	ollaboration between your induction or clear our site administration?	DNR 246	10.9%		
	= Very Strong	699	40.0%	1.79	Mea
	= Strong	718	41.1%	0.74	
_	Not Strong	329	18.8%		55
J	I do not have sufficient information to				
	answer this question st	273			
	icipating in the following activities have on your				
classroom practice?	icipating in the following activities have on your is of evidence of my teaching practice	2011	88.8%		
classroom practice?	is of evidence of my teaching practice	2011 DNR 254	11.2%	1 30	
classroom practice? 12a. Collection and analys	is of evidence of my teaching practice Extensive impact	2011 DNR 254 1447	11.2% 72.4%		
classroom practice? 12a. Collection and analys 1 2	is of evidence of my teaching practice Extensive impact Limited impact	2011 DNR 254 1447 502	11.2% 72.4% 25.1%	1.30 0.51	
classroom practice? L2a. Collection and analys 1 2	is of evidence of my teaching practice Extensive impact	2011 DNR 254 1447	11.2% 72.4%		
classroom practice? 12a. Collection and analys 1 2	is of evidence of my teaching practice Extensive impact Limited impact No impact	2011 DNR 254 1447 502 49 13	11.2% 72.4% 25.1% 2.5%		
classroom practice? 12a. Collection and analys 1 2 3	is of evidence of my teaching practice Extensive impact Limited impact No impact I did not participate in this activity *	2011 DNR 254 1447 502 49 13	11.2% 72.4% 25.1% 2.5% - 88.8%		
classroom practice? 12a. Collection and analys 1 2 3 12b. Analysis of my stude	is of evidence of my teaching practice = Extensive impact = Limited impact No impact I did not participate in this activity * nts' work	2011 DNR 254 1447 502 49 13 2012 DNR 253	11.2% 72.4% 25.1% 2.5% - 88.8% 11.2%	0.51	SD
classroom practice? 12a. Collection and analys 1 2 3 12b. Analysis of my stude	is of evidence of my teaching practice Extensive impact Limited impact No impact I did not participate in this activity * ints' work Extensive impact	2011 DNR 254 1447 502 49 13 2012 DNR 253 1518	11.2% 72.4% 25.1% 2.5% - 88.8% 11.2% 76.1%	1.26	SD Mea
classroom practice? 12a. Collection and analys 1 2 3 12b. Analysis of my stude 1 2	is of evidence of my teaching practice Extensive impact Limited impact No impact I did not participate in this activity * Ints' work Extensive impact Limited impact	2011 DNR 254 1447 502 49 13 2012 DNR 253 1518 434	11.2% 72.4% 25.1% 2.5% - 88.8% 11.2% 76.1% 21.7%	0.51	SD
classroom practice? 12a. Collection and analys 1 2 3 12b. Analysis of my stude 1 2	is of evidence of my teaching practice Extensive impact Limited impact No impact I did not participate in this activity * ints' work Extensive impact	2011 DNR 254 1447 502 49 13 2012 DNR 253 1518	11.2% 72.4% 25.1% 2.5% - 88.8% 11.2% 76.1%	1.26	Meai

Total survey respondents: 2265 Response rate: 94 %

12c. Observation of experie	nced teachers	2014	88.9%		
•		DNR 251	11.1%		
1 =	Extensive impact	1414	73.5%		Mean
2 =	Limited impact	465	24.2%	0.50	SD
3 =	No impact	45	2.3%		
	I did not participate in this activity *	90	-		
12d Francischies of such	ahira ayaati aa aasiyat tha CCTD (a a tha	2010	88.7%		
Continuum of Teaching Prac	ching practice against the CSTP (e.g., the tice)	DNR 255	11.3%		
5	Extensive impact	1320	66.9%	1.37	Mean
2 =	Limited impact	587	29.7%	0.55	
3 =	No impact	67	3.4%		30
3 -	I did not participate in this activity *	36			
	2 d.d. 1132 participates 111 discussively	30			
12a Development of my In	dividual Induction Plan (IIP)/Individual Learning	2011	88.8%		
Plan (ILP)	dividual induction riali (iii)/individual Learning	DNR 254	11.2%		
1 =	Extensive impact	1392	69.7%	1.34	Mean
2 =	Limited impact	535	26.8%	0.54	
3 =	No impact	71	3.6%		
	I did not participate in this activity *	13	_		
		2011	88.8%		
12f. Professional Learning a	s identified on my IIP or ILP	DNR 254	11.2%		
1 =	Extensive impact	1412	70.7%	1.32	Mean
2 =	Limited impact	529	26.5%	0.52	
3 =	No impact	55	2.8%		
J	I did not participate in this activity *	15	_		
		2013	88.9%		
12g. Collaboration with colle	eagues	DNR 252	11.1%		
4	Extensive impact	1622	81.0%	1 21	
_	Limited impact	350	17.5%		Mean
2 =	·			0.44	SD
3 =	No impact	31	1.5%		
	I did not participate in this activity *	10	-		

Impact of Induction on Teaching Practice

Engaging and Supporting All Students in Learning

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

13a. Connect classroom learning to the real world		87.7%	
		12.3%	
1 = Very well	906	45.6%	1.74 Mean
2 = Well	771	38.8%	0.83 <i>SD</i>
3 = Adequately	249	12.5%	
4 = Poorly	36	1.8%	
5 = Not at all	24	1.2%	

Statewide Results

Total survey respondents: 2265 Response rate: 94 %

13b. Engage students in inquiry, problem solving, and reflection to promote		1987	87.7%		
their critical thinking		DNR 278	12.3%		
1 =	Very well	920	46.3%	1.74	Mean
2 =	Well	732	36.8%	0.83	SD
3 =	Adequately	282	14.2%	L	
4 =	Poorly	35	1.8%		
5 =	Not at all	18	0.9%		
		1000	07.50/		
13c. Meet the instructional i	needs of English learners	1982	87.5%		
		DNR 283	12.5%		
1 =	Very well	900	45.4%	1.78	Mean
2 =	Well	701	35.4%	0.87	SD
3 =	Adequately	312	15.7%		
4 =	Poorly	46	2.3%		
5 =	Not at all	23	1.2%		
13d. Identify and address s	pecial learning needs with appropriate teaching	1986	87.7%		
strategies		DNR 279	12.3%	_	
1 =	Very well	1245	62.7%	1.51	Mean
2 =	Well	522	26.3%	0.76	SD
3 =	Adequately	181	9.1%		
4 =	Poorly	28	1.4%		
5 =	Not at all	10	0.5%		

Creating and Maintaining Effective Environments for Student Learning

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

14a. Establish and maintain	a safe and respectful learning environment for	1989	87.8%		
all students	,	DNR 276	12.2%		
1 =	Very well	1226	61.6%	1.51	Mean
2 =	Well	558	28.1%	0.74	SD
3 =	Adequately	177	8.9%	L	
4 =	Poorly	14	0.7%		
5 =	Not at all	14	0.7%		
•	arning environment with high expectations for all	1987	87.7%		
students		DNR 278	12.3%		
1 =	Very well	1197	60.2%		Mean
2 =	Well	588	29.6%	0.74	SD
3 =	Adequately	177	8.9%		
4 =	Poorly	12	0.6%		
5 =	Not at all	13	0.7%		
•	ems by intervening early using strategies	1983	87.5%		
matched to student's currer	nt learning and behavior level	DNR 282	12.5%		
1 =	Very well	1002	50.5%	1.69	Mean
2 =	Well	662	33.4%	0.84	SD
3 =	Adequately	263	13.3%		
4 =	Poorly	35	1.8%		
5 =	Not at all	21	1.1%		

Statewide Results

Total survey respondents: 2265 Response rate: 94 %

Understanding and Organizing Subject Matter for Student Learning

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

15a. Use effective instructional strategies to teach specific subject matter			87.5%		
and skills		DNR 282	12.5%		
1 =	Very well	1024	51.6%	1.66	Mean
2 =	Well	671	33.8%	0.81	SD
3 =	Adequately	246	12.4%		
4 =	Poorly	25	1.3%		
5 =	Not at all	17	0.9%		
15b. Select, adapt, and dev	elop materials, resources, and technologies to	1985	87.6%		
make subject matter accessible to all students			12.4%		
1 =	Very well	1065	53.7%	1.62	Mean
2 =	Well	648	32.6%	0.78	SD
3 =	Adequately	240	12.1%		
4 =	Poorly	20	1.0%		
5 =	Not at all	12	0.6%		
15c. Expand expertise with	evidence-based instructional and assistive	1982	87.5%		
technology to support stude	ent access to challenging content?	DNR 283	12.5%		
1 =	Very well	981	49.5%	1.70	Mean
2 =	Well	696	35.1%	0.83	SD
3 =	Adequately	246	12.4%		
4 =	Poorly	41	2.1%		
5 =	Not at all	18	0.9%		

Planning Instruction and Designing Learning Experiences for All Students

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

	on students' prior knowledge, academic ency, cultural background, and individual	1961 DNR 304	86.6% 13.4%		
1 =	Very well	1006	51.3%	1.66	Mean
2 =	Well	677	34.5%	0.80	
3 =	Adequately	242	12.3%		
4 =	Poorly	19	1.0%		
5 =	Not at all	17	0.9%		
	tion that incorporates appropriate strategies,	1963	86.7%		
resources and technologies	to meet the learning needs of all students	DNR 302	13.3%		
1 =	Very well	1074	54.7%	1.61	Mean
2 =	Well	632	32.2%	0.78	SD
3 =	Adequately	226	11.5%		
4 =	Poorly	17	0.9%		
5 =	Not at all	14	0.7%		
16c. Develop IFSP/IEP goals	s and objectives that are measurable and	1960	86.5%		
obtainable		DNR 305	13.5%		
1 =	Very well	1053	53.7%	1.67	Mean
2 =	Well	599	30.6%	0.88	SD
3 =	Adequately	236	12.0%		
4 =	Poorly	44	2.2%		
5 =	Not at all	28	1.4%		

Statewide Results

Total survey respondents: 2265 Response rate: 94 %

16d. Plan for instruction by	incorporating all relevant IFSP/IEP information	1959	86.5%		
behavior and academic information			13.5%		
1 =	Very well	996	50.8%	1.70	Mean
2 =	Well	642	32.8%	0.87	SD
3 =	Adequately	255	13.0%		
4 =	Poorly	41	2.1%		
5 =	Not at all	25	1.3%		
16e. Ensure students with e	exceptionalities receive appropriate instruction	1959	86.5%		
and support within the leas	t restrictive environment	DNR 306	13.5%		
1 =	Very well	1077	55.0%	1.62	Mean
2 =	Well	610	31.1%	0.82	SD
3 =	Adequately	223	11.4%		
4 =	Poorly	28	1.4%		
5 =	Not at all	21	1.1%		

Assessing Students for Learning

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

	self-assessment, goal setting, and monitoring	1965	86.8%		
progress		DNR 300	13.2%		
1 =	Very well	891	45.3%		Mean
2 =	Well	694	35.3%	0.89	SD
3 =	Adequately	307	15.6%		
4 =	Poorly	45	2.3%		
5 =	Not at all	28	1.4%		
		1965	86.8%		
17b. Give productive feedba	ack to students to guide their learning	DNR 300	13.2%		
1 =	Very well	947	48.2%	1.71	Mean
2 =	Well	707	36.0%	0.83	SD
3 =	Adequately	261	13.3%		
4 =	Poorly	31	1.6%		
5 =	Not at all	19	1.0%		
47 0 11 1 11 11		1961	86.6%		
	to ensure educational benefit when aligning and services within the least restrictive	DNR 304	13.4%		
_		1020	52.0%	1.65	
1 =	Very well				Mean
2 =	Well	653	33.3%	0.81	SD
3 =	Adequately	250	12.7%		
•	Poorly	21	1.1%		
5 =	Not at all	17	0.9%		
17d Appropriately modify a	and accommodate state and local assessments	1961	86.6%		
based on students' learning		DNR 304	13.4%		
1 =		977	49.8%	1.73	Mean
2 =	Well	637	32.5%	0.87	
3 =	Adequately	277	14.1%	0.07	Sυ
J		48	2.4%		
4 =	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	22	1.1%		
5 =	ivot at all	22	1.170		

^{*} Responses of "Don't Know" or variations on "N/A" are excluded from the percentage calculations.

Total survey respondents: 2265 Response rate: 94 %

Developing as a Professional Educator

To what degree did your overall INDUCTION/CLEAR CREDENTIAL EXPERIENCE impact your classroom practice in the following areas?

		1963	86.7%		
18a. Evaluate the effects of accordingly	of actions on student learning and modify plans	DNR 302	13.3%		
	Vorunual		52.1%	1 64	
1	W II	1022 675	34.4%	0.78	Mean
2		236	12.0%	0.76	SD
3					
·	Poorly	16	0.8%		
5	Not at all	14	0.7%		
		1963	86.7%		
18b. Work with colleagues	to improve instruction	DNR 302	13.3%		
1	Very well	1041	53.0%	1.64	Mean
_	= Well	646	32.9%	0.81	
3		233	11.9%		<i>30</i>
	Poorly	26	1.3%		
5		17	0.9%		
J		-7	0.570		
10- Duraid	of account for a consultation and laboration	1965	86.8%		
	of support for consultation, collaboration, co- n multi or interdisciplinary team members	DNR 300	13.2%		
	= Very well	999	50.8%	1 69	Mean
2		657	33.4%	0.84	
2	= 	037	33.470	0.04	SD
2	Adequately	253	12 0%		
3		253	12.9%		
4	Poorly	35	1.8%		
_	Poorly				
4 5	Poorly Not at all	35	1.8%		
4 5 19. Overall, how effectiv	Poorly Not at all was your induction program at developing	35	1.8%		
4 5 19. Overall, how effectiv	Poorly Not at all	35 21	1.8%		
4 5 19. Overall, how effective the skills, habits, or too	Poorly Not at all e was your induction program at developing ls you needed to grow your teaching	35 21 1959	1.8% 1.1% 86.5%	1.56	Mean
19. Overall, how effective the skills, habits, or too practice?	Poorly Not at all e was your induction program at developing ls you needed to grow your teaching Very effective	35 21 1959 DNR 306	1.8% 1.1% 86.5% 13.5%		Mean SD
19. Overall, how effective the skills, habits, or too practice?	Poorly Not at all e was your induction program at developing ls you needed to grow your teaching Very effective Effective Second but offertive	35 21 1959 DNR 306 1075	1.8% 1.1% 86.5% 13.5% 54.9%	1.56 0.69	
19. Overall, how effective the skills, habits, or too practice?	Poorly Not at all e was your induction program at developing ls you needed to grow your teaching Very effective Effective Somewhat effective	1959 DNR 306 1075 694	1.8% 1.1% 86.5% 13.5% 54.9% 35.4%		
19. Overall, how effective the skills, habits, or too practice?	Poorly Not at all e was your induction program at developing ls you needed to grow your teaching Very effective Effective Somewhat effective	1959 DNR 306 1075 694 173	1.8% 1.1% 86.5% 13.5% 54.9% 35.4% 8.8%		
19. Overall, how effective the skills, habits, or too practice? 1 2 3 4 20. Overall, how effective	Poorly Not at all e was your induction program at developing ls you needed to grow your teaching Very effective Effective Somewhat effective Not at all effective e was your induction program at developing	1959 DNR 306 1075 694 173	1.8% 1.1% 86.5% 13.5% 54.9% 35.4% 8.8% 0.9%		
19. Overall, how effective the skills, habits, or too practice? 1 2 3 4 20. Overall, how effective the skills, habits, or too	Poorly Not at all e was your induction program at developing ls you needed to grow your teaching Very effective Effective Somewhat effective Not at all effective	1959 DNR 306 1075 694 173 17	1.8% 1.1% 86.5% 13.5% 54.9% 35.4% 0.9%		
19. Overall, how effective the skills, habits, or too practice? 1 2 3 4 20. Overall, how effective	Poorly Not at all e was your induction program at developing ls you needed to grow your teaching Very effective Effective Somewhat effective Not at all effective e was your induction program at developing	1959 DNR 306 1075 694 173	1.8% 1.1% 86.5% 13.5% 54.9% 35.4% 8.8% 0.9%	0.69	SD
19. Overall, how effective the skills, habits, or too practice? 1 2 3 4 20. Overall, how effective the skills, habits, or too teacher?	Poorly Not at all e was your induction program at developing ls you needed to grow your teaching Very effective Effective Somewhat effective Not at all effective e was your induction program at developing ls you needed to continue in your career as a Very effective	1959 DNR 306 1075 694 173 17	1.8% 1.1% 86.5% 13.5% 54.9% 35.4% 0.9%	1.55	SD
19. Overall, how effective the skills, habits, or too practice? 1 2 3 4 20. Overall, how effective the skills, habits, or too teacher?	Poorly Not at all e was your induction program at developing ls you needed to grow your teaching Very effective Effective Somewhat effective Not at all effective e was your induction program at developing ls you needed to continue in your career as a	1959 DNR 306 1075 694 173 17	1.8% 1.1% 86.5% 13.5% 54.9% 35.4% 8.8% 0.9%	0.69	SD
19. Overall, how effective the skills, habits, or too practice? 1 2 3 4 20. Overall, how effective the skills, habits, or too teacher?	Poorly Not at all e was your induction program at developing ls you needed to grow your teaching Very effective Effective Somewhat effective Not at all effective e was your induction program at developing ls you needed to continue in your career as a Very effective Effective Effective	1959 DNR 306 1075 694 173 17 1960 DNR 305 1090	1.8% 1.1% 86.5% 13.5% 54.9% 35.4% 8.8% 0.9% 86.5% 13.5% 55.6%	1.55	SD

Demographic Information

24 August Historia and atting 2	1948	86.0%
21. Are you Hispanic or Latino?	DNR 317	14.0%
No, not Hispanic or Latino	1353	69.5%
Yes, Hispanic or Latino	595	30.5%

Total survey respondents: 2265 Response rate: 94 %

22. What is	your	race?	Mark	all	that	apply	/
-------------	------	-------	------	-----	------	-------	---

all that apply			
	DNR 510	22.5%	
American Indian or Alaska Native	93	4.1%	
Chinese	45	2.0%	
Japanese	26	1.1%	
Korean	27	1.2%	
Vietnamese	17	0.8%	
Asian Indian	18	0.8%	
Laotian	6	0.3%	
Cambodian	4	0.2%	
Filipino	59	2.6%	
Hmong	6	0.3%	
Other Asian	18	0.8%	
Black or African American	136	6.0%	
Hawaiian	15	0.7%	
Guamanian	6	0.3%	
Samoan	4	0.2%	
Tahitian 1			
Other Pacific Islander 8			
White	1437	63.4%	

1755 77.5%

1948 86.0%

Date: 10/15/2018

23. In what type of school did you teach during your induction program? Mark all that apply

a you teach during your induction program:		
	DNR 317	14.0%
Public	1722	76.0%
Charter	162	7.2%
Private	16	0.7%
Non-public special education	94	4.2%
Other	34	1.5%

24. What is your gender?

	1951	86.1%
	DNR 314	13.9%
Female	1499	76.8%
Male	416	21.3%
Decline to state	36	1.8%

Response Rate by Program Sponsor (Statewide completion rate is 94 %)

# Survey Requests Made	Comple	of Program eters who oonded	Name of Institution
8	7	87.5 %	ALHAMBRA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
6	6	100 %	ALLIANT INTERNATIONAL UNIVERSITY
2	2	100 %	ANIMO LEADERSHIP CHARTER HIGH SCHOOL (GREEN DOT PUBLIC SCHOOLS)
3	2	66.67 %	ANTELOPE VALLEY UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
2	2	100 %	ANTIOCH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
1	1	100 %	ARCADIA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
8	8	100 %	ASPIRE PUBLIC SCHOOLS
61	57	93.44 %	AZUSA PACIFIC UNIVERSITY
13	13	100 %	BAKERSFIELD CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
3	3	100 %	BELLFLOWER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
6	6	100 %	BRENTWOOD UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
3	2	66.67 %	CALIFORNIA SCHOOL FOR THE DEAF, FREMONT
3	3	100 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, BAKERSFIELD
38	35	92.11 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, DOMINGUEZ HILLS
20	20	100 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FRESNO
91	86	94.51 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, FULLERTON
18	16	88.89 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LONG BEACH
52	52	100 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, LOS ANGELES
9	8	88.89 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, MONTEREY BAY
41	40	97.56 %	CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE
6	5	83.33 %	CAMPBELL UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
12	12	100 %	CAPISTRANO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
8	8	100 %	CHULA VISTA ELEMENTARY SCHOOL DISTRICT
1	1	100 %	CLAREMONT GRADUATE UNIVERSITY
8	8	100 %	CLOVIS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
1	1	100 %	COMPTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
5	4	80 %	CONCORDIA UNIVERSITY IRVINE
4	4	100 %	CONEJO VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
25	24	96 %	CONTRA COSTA COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
11	11	100 %	CORONA-NORCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
2	2	100 %	CULVER CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
3	3	100 %	CUPERTINO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
21	19	90.48 %	DAVIS JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
1	1	100 %	DOS PALOS ORO LOMA JOINT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
21	19	90.48 %	EL DORADO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
4	4	100 %	EL RANCHO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
19	19	100 %	ELK GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
6	5	83.33 %	ENCINITAS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
1	1	100 %	ESCONDIDO UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
3	3	100 %	ESCONDIDO UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
7	7	100 %	ETIWANDA SCHOOL DISTRICT
10	10	100 %	FAIRFIELD-SUISUN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
16	13	81.25 %	FONTANA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
16	15	93.75 %	FREMONT UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT

Response Rate by Program Sponsor (Statewide completion rate is 94 %)

# Survey Requests Made	Comple	of Program eters who oonded	Name of Institution
3	2	66.67 %	FREMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
41	40	97.56 %	FRESNO COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
4	4	100 %	FULLERTON SCHOOL DISTRICT
9	9	100 %	GARDEN GROVE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
1	1	100 %	GLENDALE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
4	4	100 %	GREENFIELD UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
5	4	80 %	GROSSMONT UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
6	6	100 %	HACIENDA LA PUENTE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
15	15	100 %	HAYWARD UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
11	11	100 %	HIGH TECH HIGH
17	17	100 %	IMPERIAL COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
14	14	100 %	IRVINE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
33	33	100 %	KERN COUNTY SUPERINTENDENT OF SCHOOLS
6	6	100 %	KERN HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
7	7	100 %	KINGS COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
2	2	100 %	LA MESA-SPRING VALLEY SCHOOL DISTRICT
6	6	100 %	LANCASTER SCHOOL DISTRICT
9	7	77.78 %	LODI UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
11	11	100 %	LONG BEACH UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
103	93	90.29 %	LOS ANGELES COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
154	139	90.26 %	LOS ANGELES UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
2	2	100 %	LOS BANOS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
9	8	88.89 %	MADERA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
9	9	100 %	MANTECA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
14	11	78.57 %	MARIN COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
8	7	87.5 %	MERCED COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
3	3	100 %	MERCED UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
6	6	100 %	MILPITAS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
8	7	87.5 %	MODESTO CITY SCHOOLS
8	7	87.5 %	MONTEREY COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
5	3	60 %	MT. DIABLO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
9	9	100 %	MURRIETA VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
4	4	100 %	NAPA COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
44	40	90.91 %	NATIONAL UNIVERSITY
2	1	50 %	NEW HAVEN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
12	10	83.33 %	NEWARK UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
7	6	85.71 %	OAK GROVE SCHOOL DISTRICT
17	17	100 %	OAKLAND UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
5	5	100 %	ONTARIO-MONTCLAIR SCHOOL DISTRICT
8	8	100 %	ORANGE COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
7	7	100 %	ORANGE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
4	4	100 %	PALMDALE SCHOOL DISTRICT
1	1	100 %	PALO ALTO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
4	4	100 %	PANAMA-BUENA VISTA UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT

Response Rate by Program Sponsor (Statewide completion rate is 94 %)

# Survey Requests Made	Comple	of Program eters who oonded	Name of Institution
8	7	87.5 %	PLACENTIA-YORBA LINDA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
17	16	94.12 %	PLACER COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
15	15	100 %	PLEASANTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
13	12	92.31 %	POINT LOMA NAZARENE UNIVERSITY
12	12	100 %	POWAY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
4	3	75 %	PUC SCHOOLS
7	6	85.71 %	RIALTO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
249	241	96.79 %	RIVERSIDE COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
13	13	100 %	RIVERSIDE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
13	10	76.92 %	SACRAMENTO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
42	41	97.62 %	SACRAMENTO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
6	6	100 %	SADDLEBACK VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
34	32	94.12 %	SAN BERNARDINO CITY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
54	51	94.44 %	SAN DIEGO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
34	31	91.18 %	SAN DIEGO STATE UNIVERSITY
26	24	92.31 %	SAN DIEGO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
1	1	100 %	SAN DIEGUITO UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
25	24	96 %	SAN FRANCISCO STATE UNIVERSITY
24	21	87.5 %	SAN FRANCISCO UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
12	12	100 %	SAN GABRIEL UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
4	4	100 %	SAN JOSE STATE UNIVERSITY
8	8	100 %	SAN JOSE UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
7	6	85.71 %	SAN JUAN UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
14	12	85.71 %	SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
14	14	100 %	SAN MARCOS UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
3	3	100 %	SAN MATEO - FOSTER CITY SCHOOL DISTRICT
46	43	93.48 %	SAN MATEO COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
5	4	80 %	SAN RAMON VALLEY UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
3	3	100 %	SANGER UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
24	23	95.83 %	SANTA ANA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
19	18	94.74 %	SANTA BARBARA COUNTY EDUCATION OFFICE
10	9	90 %	SANTA CLARA COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
7	7	100 %	SANTA CLARA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
49	48	97.96 %	SANTA CRUZ COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
8	7	87.5 %	SANTA MONICA-MALIBU UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
6	6	100 %	SAUGUS UNION SCHOOL DISTRICT
3	2	66.67 %	SCHOOL FOR INTEGRATED ACADEMICS AND TECHNOLOGY (SIA TECH)
2	2	100 %	SELMA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
2	2	100 %	SEQUOIA UNION HIGH SCHOOL DISTRICT
46	43	93.48 %	SONOMA COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
9	8	88.89 %	SONOMA STATE UNIVERSITY
30	27	90 %	STANISLAUS COUNTY OFFICE OF EDUCATION
9	9	100 %	STOCKTON UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT
3	3	100 %	SUMMIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS

Response Rate by Program Sponsor (Statewide completion rate is 94 %)

# Survey Requests	Comple	of Program eters who	
de	Resp	onded	
18	18	100 %	
20	16	80 %	
15	11	73.33 %	
17	16	94.12 %	
2	2	100 %	
1	1	100 %	
27	25	92.59 %	
4	3	<i>75</i> %	
1	1	100 %	
18	18	100 %	
35	34	97.14 %	
5	5	100 %	
11	10	90.91 %	
9	9	100 %	
3	3	100 %	
9	9	100 %	
14	13	92.86 %	
1	1	100 %	
3	3	100 %	